

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                   | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.    |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| 10/017,193                        | 12/12/2001      | Mai Huong Dang       | 52200.8010          | 52200.8010 5901     |  |  |
| 22918                             | 7590 11/08/2004 |                      | EXAM                | EXAMINER            |  |  |
| PERKINS COIE LLP<br>P.O. BOX 2168 |                 |                      | PADGETT, M          | PADGETT, MARIANNE L |  |  |
| MENLO PARK, CA 94026              |                 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER        |  |  |
|                                   |                 |                      | 1762                |                     |  |  |

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Advisory Action   |  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)                                   | ام                |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|-------------------|--|--|--|
|   |  | 10/017,193   | DANG ET AL.                                    | 47                |  |  |  |
|   |  | Examiner   | Art Unit                                       |                   |  |  |  |
| -   |  | Marianne L. Padgett  | 1762   |                   |  |  |  |
|   | The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | correspondence add                             | ress              |  |  |  |
| final<br>cond   | REPLY FILED 15 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE refore, further action by the applicant is required to a rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 dition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearmination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | void abandonment of this applic  | cation. A proper rep                           | ply to a          |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| a)  | The state of the final rejection.  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
|   | The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advievent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 1706.07(f).  | an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of<br>FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE | f the final rejection.<br>E FINAL REJECTION. S | See MPEP          |  |  |  |
| 37 CF<br>(b) ab   | Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat<br>been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens<br>FR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened<br>ove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more<br>d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the                                 | fee. The appropriate ext                       | tension fee under |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>15 October 2004</u>. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.</li> </ol> |  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| 2.🖂   | The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be   | ecause:  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| (a) $\boxtimes$ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| (   | <ul> <li>c) \( \sum \) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>  | n better form for appeal by mate   | erially reducing or s                          | implifying the    |  |  |  |
| (d) 🔲 they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.   |  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.   |  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.   |  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| 4.  | Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se  | eparate, timely filed                          | amendment         |  |  |  |
| 6.  | 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) requiples the application in condition for allowed the affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ance because: See Continuation S   | Sheet  |                   |  |  |  |
| 7.🖂   | For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment( explanation of how the new or amended claims wo  | s) a) will not be entered or b)  | will be entered a                              | and an            |  |  |  |
|   | The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   | provided boto  | o. apponded.                                   |                   |  |  |  |
|   | Claim(s) allowed:  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
|   | Claim(s) objected to:  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
|   | Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15,20-26 and 29-31</u> .   |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| •   | Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 11,16-19,27-28,32.  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| 8.  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| 9.  | _  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
| 10.   | 0. Other:  |  |  |                   |  |  |  |
|   |  | Mariann Husett   | MARIANNE PADGI<br>PRIMARY EXAMIN               | ETT<br>IER        |  |  |  |

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 110/017,193

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: 1)the requirement of atmospheric plasma in a chamber as opposed to open atmosphere is a new issue; 2) exposing the surface (no longer necessarily the treated/exposed surface, so no positively claimed conversion of active species, only implied) to liquid or gas without plasma is a new issue; 3) as the treating step (a), has been changed to an exposing step, it is no longer clear when the optional contacting step is preformed, also a new issue.

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the art rejections based on Beumer et al lacks an exposure step in the absence of plasma, hence would be overcome.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The new issues need further consideration & possible search, also while Ikada et al do not teach necessary use of a chamber when performing atmospheric pressure corona discharge, neither do they exclude use of a chamber, which would provide protection from contamination, etc, hence there are motivatin reasons to employ such depending on conditions at the production site, etc., so this new issue would need revised rejections.